

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_98592</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Impact of phosphorus fertilizer and spacing on growth and yield of cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp.)”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>* The paper is generally moderately written and structured. However, in my opinion the paper has some shortcomings in regards to some data analyses and text, and I feel this unique dataset has not been utilized to its full extent. Below I have provided numerous remarks on the text as it is often vague and long-winded. In several instances I also suggested to cite more relevant and recent literature. Furthermore I made additional suggestions for more in-depth analyses of the data.</p> <p>* Lengthy titles can be boring and appear unfocused, whereas very short titles may not be representative of the contents of the article; hence, optimum length is required to ensure that the title explains the main theme and content of the manuscript (e.g., suggest an alternative title: EFFECT OF PHOSPHORUS LEVELS ON GROWTH, YIELD AND DEVELOPMENT OF COWPEA (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp) VARIETIES</p> <p>* Such important words (or keywords) should be arranged in appropriate order of importance as per the context of the paper and should be placed at the beginning of the title (rather than the later part of the title, as some search engines like Google may just display only the six to seven words of the title).</p> <p>* Scientific papers are for sharing your own original research work with other scientists or for reviewing the research conducted by others. As such, they are critical to the evolution of modern science, in which the work of one scientist builds upon that of others. To reach their goal, papers must aim to inform, not impress. They must be highly readable that is, clear, accurate, and concise. They are more likely to be cited by other scientists if they are helpful rather than cryptic or self-centered.</p> <p>*Abstract: Please focus the abstract on your study and your results. I would prefer to see some data on effect of different levels of phosphorus on growth and yield of cowpea varieties (e.g., in Dang, Nepal). More generally, I suggest focusing the manuscript on the scientific results.</p> <p>*1 The abstract is too shallow 2.The results were merely enumerated without indicating their significance to the study 3.The abstract is inconclusive because of the following: 4.No indication of contribution to scientific knowledge 5.No suggestions and or recommendation to the farmers as regards the applicability of the above method for a better crop yield. 6.The abstract is supposed to be an overview of the entire research, but reverse is the case 7.The abstract needs to be completely recast to capture the above suggestions.</p> <p>* Keywords very scanty, 8-10 is recommended.</p> <p>* The results of the statistical analysis were analysed by one-way/ two way analysis of variance (Anova), this was followed, where applicable, with Tukey's multiple comparison or other test of multiple means. Is not really clear in your analytical description, it is necessary to show and justify more in the text.</p> <p>* P5, L106-112: What is the source of the crop specimen used for this experiment and who was the taxonomist or herbarium curator that authenticated the specimen? The voucher number is also very important for reference's sake</p> <p>* P5, L110-111: Did u measure these soil parameters? If yes, how did you measure them?</p> <p>* The control was glaringly absent from your methodology, why?</p> <p>* Your data is supposed to be subjected to a suitable statistical tool to help bring out the ignificant of non-significant outcome. If you did. Then state the package you used and how it was used. It should reflect in your abstract.</p> <p>* P5, L121-122: In statistical analysis, can you explain that the Anova test is involved to compare what as variables with the significance threshold at P = 0.05 or the treatment means were separated by Least Significant Difference (LSD) at 5% probability level.</p> <p>* Results and Discussion: P11, 12, 13; Do you mean "The value of the growth rate in the statistical analysis obtained has a small value". Please clarify statement.</p> <p>* Check for grammar errors in the manuscript because they are many</p> <p>* Discussion: No data is presented on the comparison of means (Tukey's multiple comparisons) in case of significant difference. Please be more specific in the terminology used to describe your data.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>* Throughout the main text keep the same reference structures eg. (Cobbinah <i>et al.</i>, 2016)</p> <p>* In the reference part add the page range after giving the volume of the journal</p> <p>* In the bibliographic section some authors and sources of information is not cited in the text (e.g. P 1187; (Rathore <i>et al.</i>, 2005) and P1219; (Whitbread and Lawrence, 2006))</p> <p>*Page 4: L1090-10915 (Conclusion part): the sentence is very awkward and meaning is obscured. Suggest re-</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>writing to clarify.</p> <p>* p9, L256-259: you can explain and give me more detail for the following sentence " Maximum stover yield was significantly influenced by the application of Phosphorus (50kg/ha) that increased the production of plant biomass, nodule number and weight and chlorophyll content in leaf extract----- hibited significant positive correlation with grain and stover yield"</p> <p>*P4, L59-60: There are much better references than just one reference from Singh <i>et al.</i>, 2007, for the assertions- including review papers by working groups.</p> <p>*P8, Conclusion: you exploited properly your results and put them with more detail in the conclusion</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>*Could it be advisable to look at other International results? A reference table could be handy.</p> <p>* The rationale for including statistical data must be well explained. The vast majority of the data in the document relate to the significant difference.</p> <p>* Page 14, L1088-1091: Are phosphorus fertilizer and spacing on growth and yield of cowpea determined consistent with the purpose of the study as it should appear in what is essentially the conclusions section of the manuscript?</p> <p>*For more reliable data, you can add the values of the relative precision (uncertainties) of the means obtained as affirmative results explaining the error committed in your work</p> <p>*How you can explain that ANOVA test revealed the existing of the significant differences between treatment plot samples with a significance threshold at <math>P = .05</math></p> <p>* If the Tukey's Honestly Significantly Different (HSD) test was also applied in your statistical samples analysis to identify what?</p> <p>* In your work can you specify and explain the type of Anova test (one way or two way) process? explains your statement it is possible</p> <p>* several of the abbreviations mentioned in the text which are not explained (e.g., DAS, RBD...and so on)</p> <p>* Please write in full for proper understanding.</p> <p>* This paper has a potential to be accepted, but some important points have to be clarified or fixed before we can proceed and a positive action can be taken. Generally this paper needs Critical Improvement.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rafik Kebabsa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kasdi Merbah Ouargla University, Algeria</b>